

AD A100986

LEVEL

DTIC  
ELECTE

JUL 7 1981

ETHICS AND THE MILITARY PROFESSION

Published periodically by the Ethics and Professionalism Committee, USMA)

SPORTS AND THE MILITARY

(January 1980)

FOCUS

10/James L. Narel

The similarities between athletic competition and combat have been frequently cited by both military and sports figures. The labels used in one activity have become metaphors in the language of the other. But while the parallels are frequently obvious and undeniable, arguments are sometimes made that pursue the analogy into areas of questionable application. While both are physical, competitive activities, an athletic contest, however grueling or punishing, is not war; and war, obviously, is never simply a game. The feature article addresses the connection between sports and war and, more specifically, the focus on winning in each activity.

**NEW FORMAT.** The present edition of the journal experiments with a new format. Fictitious characters, expressing opposing popular viewpoints, explore the feature subject in a dialogue. The tone is deliberately less formal than that which one would normally encounter in an academic paper; the intention is to conduct an intellectually sound investigation of the subject in an entertaining and provocative way. The opinions of the personae are documented in a summary fashion in the annotated bibliography which follows the dialogue. This approach is designed to encourage informal debate among readers, to be useful to those who employ the journal as a discussion starter at commanders' calls and the like, and to remain a creditable source of ideas and information for those engaged in more formal scholarship. Your comments are invited. Please address all questions, comments, or suggestions to CPT JAMES L. NAREL, Department of English, West Point, NY 10996. Telephone: (914) 938-4338; Autovon: 688-4338.

This document has been approved  
for public release and sale; its  
distribution is unlimited.

230600 LB  
81 7 02 099

LEVEL

DTIC  
ELECTE

JUL 7 1981

F

ETHICS AND THE MILITARY PROFESSION

(Published periodically by the Ethics and Professionalism Committee, USMA)

SPORTS AND THE MILITARY

(January 1980)

FOCUS

10/James L. Narel

The similarities between athletic competition and combat have been frequently cited by both military and sports figures. The labels used in one activity have become metaphors in the language of the other. But while the parallels are frequently obvious and undeniable, arguments are sometimes made that pursue the analogy into areas of questionable application. While both are physical, competitive activities, an athletic contest, however grueling or punishing, is not war; and war, obviously, is never simply a game. The feature article addresses the connection between sports and war and, more specifically, the focus on winning in each activity.

**NEW FORMAT.** The present edition of the journal experiments with a new format. Fictitious characters, expressing opposing popular viewpoints, explore the feature subject in a dialogue. The tone is deliberately less formal than that which one would normally encounter in an academic paper; the intention is to conduct an intellectually sound investigation of the subject in an entertaining and provocative way. The opinions of the personae are documented in a summary fashion in the annotated bibliography which follows the dialogue. This approach is designed to encourage informal debate among readers, to be useful to those who employ the journal as a discussion starter at commanders' calls and the like, and to remain a creditable source of ideas and information for those engaged in more formal scholarship. Your comments are invited. Please address all questions, comments, or suggestions to CPT JAMES L. NAREL, Department of English, West Point, NY 10996. Telephone: (914) 938-4338; Autovon: 688-4338.

This document has been approved  
for public release and sale; its  
distribution is unlimited.

230600 LB  
81 7 02 099

## FEATURE ARTICLE

### SPORTS AND WINNING Their Role in Military Training-- A Dialogue

CPT James L. Narel

*An Officers' Club. Three captains in fatigue uniforms sit at a small table having their lunch.*

JUSTIN: Did you see the newspaper write-up of the Army-Navy game?

VICTOR: Yes, and it made me furious! That headline: "A Proud Tradition Fades: Army Bears the Image of a Loser"! It's really discouraging--and a professional embarrassment.

HENRY-DAVID: Hey, man. It's only a football game. What's the big deal?

JUSTIN: You are being a bit dramatic, Vic. I don't like losing, but there's always next year. Right?

VICTOR: We've been hearing that for some time. I'm serious about this. I sometimes wonder if the Military Academy is doing all it should to foster a winning attitude among cadets.

JUSTIN: I admit that it's discouraging to follow the team from year to year and to see winning seasons only occasionally. But I'm not sure there's any easy solution. College football is getting so competitive--not only on the field, but particularly in recruiting. The Military Academy needs to be careful to maintain its priorities, and I think that necessarily limits their ability to compete with the "football factories."

VICTOR: I'm not willing to accept that. I'm not saying Army has to be in the Top Ten every year, but if we're going to participate in the sport we ought to go all the way. We ought to play the big schools, and we ought to win.

JUSTIN: Hey, what about "It's not whether you win or lose, it's how you play the game"? You know there's a lot more to athletics than seeing who scores the most points.

HENRY-DAVID: Right. In fact, I think the whole concept of winners and losers detracts from the appropriate goal of sports, namely, performance that is excellent in terms of the performer's individual potential.

JUSTIN: Well, I'm not sure I'd go that far. I think a sense of competition is useful in sports. I just don't think it should become the major objective.

VICTOR: I don't believe you guys! You both played college sports. How can you even talk about athletic activities without implying the pursuit of victory? All sports, whether they're team or individual efforts, involve competing with an opponent, and success means defeating the other guy. I mean, that's what it's all about. Furthermore, if we're talking about sports and the Army, winning is critically important.

JUSTIN: I think you're overstating the case a bit. First of all, the goals of athletic participation are no different for people in the Army than for people in any other walk of life. Sports gives the participant an opportunity to develop coordination, strength, stamina, and quickness.

HENRY-DAVID: Right.

JUSTIN: It encourages him to exert himself to his maximum potential, to learn his own limitations, and to extend them by practice and effort. It teaches self-discipline.

HENRY-DAVID. Right on!

JUSTIN: And, H.D., when it's a competitive team sport, it teaches self-sacrifice, cooperation, acceptance of authority, and a sense of group pride.

VICTOR: Only if you win!

JUSTIN: Oh, I don't think so. Of course, nobody wants to be a perpetual loser, but the characteristics I mentioned are developed even when the other team scores more points. That's the real beauty of sports: everyone who participates is a winner.

VICTOR: Well, I'll take the side of most athletic coaches, who would disagree and who would say that the way to foster pride and develop a willingness for self-sacrifice is to win. Knute Rockne said he'd rather be tough on his players to make them winners than to let them take it easy and lose. He knew that losers would hate their coaches in the long run, but winners would forget their aches and pains. Look, it's just human nature. We're all naturally competitive--some more so than others, of course. But what makes man great is his willingness to take on a challenge and his unwillingness to accept defeat, either at the hands of nature or of his fellow man.

JUSTIN: But you seem to be saying that winning is everything, that the athlete should do anything in his power to defeat his opponent.

VICTOR: Of course! I'll go even further and, like Lombardi, say, "Winning isn't everything; it's the only thing."

Availability Codes	
Dist	Avail and/or Special
A	

JUSTIN: That's dramatic rhetoric, but you don't really believe that. You've already agreed that sports are good because they develop character in a number of ways.

VICTOR: True, but the commitment to victory is the essential ingredient for making it all happen. What makes a player put out? What makes him willing to subordinate his own interests to the team's? What keeps him going when he's tired or when he doubts his ability to hang on? It's the belief that he can win. When he refuses to accept the thought of losing to the other guy, he reaches inside himself for that little bit extra. Only then do you get maximum performance.

JUSTIN: But don't you see that all this happens no matter what the final score is? Sure, we commit ourselves to winning when we're on the field. But there's no shame in losing as long as we've done our best. The final score is incidental.

VICTOR: I dare you to make that speech in a locker room! I tell you, that's just not consistent with our biological make-up. The reason that the human species has survived and established its dominance on this planet is that its members are inherently aggressive. When we encounter danger, we don't simply run away; we overcome it. We're not satisfied to simply escape a threat; we know, intellectually and biologically, that we must defeat it. This is what it is to be a human being. It's why we invented competitive sports in the first place, and it's why we're not happy when we lose.

JUSTIN: Well, that's one theory of human nature. There are others, such as those that stress man's social nature, that would lead to very different conclusions. Perhaps what is really essential to man is stable, cooperative, mutually confirming relationships with other human beings. That being the case, we ought to curb or channel our aggressiveness, which might be simply the product of frustration or obsolete biological tendencies. And sports might be one useful activity leading toward this end. Competing in restrained, civilized ways, we might promote our physical and psychological health while encouraging cooperation and individual excellence.

VICTOR: That all sounds very nice, but why is it that we are so anxious to win and so dissatisfied when we lose? Why have we created sports as a competitive activity if we are not motivated by some inherent desire to win?

JUSTIN: Well, I would answer that by agreeing in part with something you said earlier. Competition does encourage us to put forth our best effort. When we are committed to outdoing the other guy, we strive a bit harder than we might otherwise. The goal of victory increases our motivation and, hence, improves our performance.

VICTOR: But that's what I've been saying all along! How do our views differ?

JUSTIN: Well, it's a matter of priorities. In this case, reversing the priorities makes a radical difference. You see, you suggest that commitment to winning is the critical thing and that the development of desirable character traits naturally follows. I contend that our objective when we choose to participate in sports is to acquire the character traits, not to win the contest.

VICTOR: I fail to see that as a "radical difference" since one leads to the other.

JUSTIN: Ah, but it is! You said before that winning is everything. Would you throw a hand grenade into the opposing team's locker room in order to defeat them?

VICTOR: Don't be absurd. Of course I wouldn't, but that doesn't mean that I'm not committed to winning. Obviously what I meant was that I'd do anything within the purview of the rules. Winning means defeating the opponent at whatever sport we're playing; it doesn't mean murdering him.

JUSTIN: Ah, but when you acknowledge that point, you are qualifying your commitment to victory in an important way. If you said, "Winning is everything," and meant it literally, fragging the opponent would not be absurd at all, since it would mean his defeat. But when you define victory in terms of an artificially created set of rules, you are giving it an entirely different meaning. The set of rules--the "game"--encompasses the concept of winning at that game. Hence, we do not engage in the sport simply in order to win but to achieve some broader objective.

VICTOR: I guess I recognize a conceptual distinction, but does it have any significance in the real world?

JUSTIN: Definitely. To my mind, it is the failure to recognize this distinction that has led to "number-one-ism" in contemporary sports. People seem to be thinking, "Since what we do in sports is strive to win, winning must be success, and losing must be failure." But equating success with winning is superficial, and it leads some to feel that because their team did not win the national championship, it did not "succeed." This view has two unfortunate consequences that I can think of. First, it detracts from the real value of participation, effort, and fine performance. The superb plays and the magnificent individual and team efforts throughout the season are seen as "wasted" since some other team won the championship. Secondly, this attitude encourages the pursuit of victory at any cost. When winning is the only thing you value, you tend to do whatever enhances its prospects. Then you have recruiting violations, deliberate efforts to debilitate opposing players, and, in general, the dehumanizing of the activity and the brutalization of its participants.

HENRY-DAVID: I fully agree! But you seem not to understand that this perversion of sport is almost inevitable when it is a competitive enterprise. In my view the athlete should compete only with himself. Only the individual can know--can feel--his own potential and know his own limitations. He should not be made to feel, because another athlete has done better, that his own performance is less satisfactory. The athlete's goal is to perform up to his own potential. The performance of others is irrelevant to his own. Even though we often have greater motivation when we're competing with others, the cost of this incentive is always unacceptable. The competitive situation encourages evaluating one person's performance in terms of another's, and this is inherently wrong. It is fundamentally opposed to the real goal of sports.

VICTOR: Which is . . .

HENRY-DAVID: Which is to provide the individual with an opportunity to exercise and develop his own individual physical and psychological capabilities, measured only against his own potential.

JUSTIN: But what about team effort, cooperation, and the subordination of individual goals to group objectives? Aren't these worthwhile pursuits that your view of sports would not permit?

HENRY-DAVID: Certainly they are worthwhile, and my approach to athletics would not neglect them. And while developing these and the individual virtues, it would strive for an additional objective you both have chosen to ignore: aesthetic achievement.

VICTOR: Uh, oh. H.D. is going to wax artistic on us.

HENRY-DAVID: Not really. I'm sure you guys really do have an aesthetic appreciation of sports; you just haven't addressed it here. You both appreciate fine performance. What do you feel when you see a receiver give a great fake to get past his man, then jump impossibly high, and make a one-handed catch?

VICTOR: It depends which team he's on.

HENRY-DAVID: C'mon, Vic.

VICTOR: I see your point. You do admire a great play, no matter who performs it.

HENRY-DAVID: I think we do more than "admire" it. When we see an athlete seem to defy gravity or make an exceptionally great move, we appreciate with our sentiment as well as with our intellect. In other words, we have an aesthetic experience.

VICTOR: But your example is taken from a competitive, team sport. How are you going to achieve this in a non-competitive activity, and how are you going to develop the social virtues we mentioned?

HENRY-DAVID: Easy. Think of the events in gymnastics. They require strength, timing, coordination, and endurance; and acquiring the skills demands self-sacrifice, determination, and persistence. At the same time, the excellence of the performance is measured individually and appreciated aesthetically. What more can you ask of a sport?

JUSTIN: But gymnastics is competitive.

VICTOR: And it doesn't really develop team skills.

HENRY-DAVID: You're both right. But in my opinion, the competition in gymnastics is artificial. We call it a "meet," total up points, and declare one group the winner. That's really dumb, since the events themselves and our appreciation of them are totally unaffected by such trivialities. But there's no reason why we couldn't drop the scoring and make the events more team-oriented. Think of acrobatics. When you see talented performers accomplishing incredible physical feats as an intricate and cooperative effort, you appreciate all that goes into making it happen, and nobody needs to keep score.

JUSTIN: You know, Vic, ol' H.D. may have a point.

VICTOR: Oh, I don't argue that activities like that aren't worthwhile. They have their place, and so do ballet and juggling, which accomplish a lot of the same things. But I don't call these activities "sports," and I don't see them replacing the tough, competitive events, like football and hockey.

HENRY-DAVID: Authorized mayhem!

VICTOR: Call them what you like, but they encourage important kinds of development that aren't a part of acrobatics and such. Their benefit depends on their being pursued seriously---that is, with a desire to win. I think this is critical. And that brings us back to square one. I'm thinking about the role of sports in the military, in preparing people to meet the physical and mental rigors of combat. When we use sports for that purpose, we've got to play to win!

JUSTIN: Well, once again I have to say that it seems to me that the qualities we want people to demonstrate in combat can be acquired in sports without overemphasizing winning.

VICTOR: When sports are used in support of military development, you can't overemphasize winning. You're implying that we should say to our men, "Go



out there and fight a nice clean war. Give it your best shot, but don't be too concerned about winning or losing. What counts is how you play the game." Bull!

JUSTIN: That's not what I mean at all. I'm simply saying that you're pressing an analogy between sports and combat that is not valid. Sure, winning is our goal in war. But combat is a desperate, unavoidable circumstance in which losing means death or enslavement. Athletic contests, however physical or demanding, are not the same thing.

VICTOR: My point is that tough, physical sports are perhaps the closest analogies to combat that we can find. When you're on the athletic field, you know that if you don't defend yourself you'll be smeared. If you don't take the fight to your opponent, he's going to make you fight on his terms. If you're not completely committed to beating the other guy, you're going to get your clock cleaned. Obviously, the same thing is true in war. The parallel between the two activities is undeniable, and I say we ought to exploit it. We should stress competitive, contact sports throughout the Army, and we should stress winning at these sports, not simply playing well. We should reward those who are victorious, and we should "fire up" the losers to make them work harder. It's the best thing we could do for our soldiers, ourselves, and the country.

JUSTIN: I see your system resulting in all kinds of brutality and corruption, not to mention needless injury. Every athletic contest will be a grudge match, each team employing whatever tactics it can get away with and soldiers battling brutally against their fellow soldiers. Teams on their way to defeat will attempt all sorts of desperate measures to salvage a victory.

VICTOR: Now you've got the idea! The whole point is to make it a desperate, demanding exercise. That's what war is, and we're preparing the warriors.

JUSTIN: You're going to create insensitive engines of violence! You're going to encourage people to seek victory at any cost.

VICTOR: Exactly! Tell me what's wrong with that. It's exactly what MacArthur was talking about. I know you've seen the words a thousand times, but think about them: "On the fields of friendly strife are sown the seeds that upon other fields, on other days, will bear the fruits of victory." He saw the connection between sports and combat, and he, more than anyone, stressed the importance of victory.

JUSTIN: Now wait a minute. Your interpretation of those words is a bit permissive. Notice that MacArthur refers to fields of "friendly" strife. You're suggesting that we create artificial battlefields. And the "seeds" he mentions aren't unrestricted force and unbridled brutality. They are strength, endurance, and cooperation.

VICTOR: Once again you drain the concept of all its vitality. MacArthur and I want to win. We know that playing well isn't good enough. We need winners in the foxholes, not survivors!

JUSTIN: A cute rhetorical trick. Now I'm supposed to argue against you and MacArthur. You're not going to get away with that one. I'm as committed to victory in war as you or MacArthur, but I claim that the general was not implying that we should win at any cost, either in sports or in war.

VICTOR: I don't believe my ears! You really are advocating that we "play nice" aren't you?

JUSTIN: Well, only in a way. Look, there are rules in sports, and there are rules even in war. Your idea to make our troops so single-mindedly committed to victory is likely to cause what few humanitarian restrictions there are in warfare to be regarded with contempt. You're going to turn loose on the battlefield a bunch of killing machines, and the result is going to be a moral disaster.

VICTOR: In case you haven't noticed, war is a moral disaster. Your putting ethical boxing gloves on our troops isn't going to help them any; it's going to get them killed.

HENRY-DAVID: You're opening up a whole new argument here. We might debate the appropriateness of the Law of Land Warfare another time. But Justin's point is well taken. We can't condone totally unrestricted violence, even in war. Establishing a "winning-is-everything" attitude could result in lapses in judgment and lack of restraint. On the other hand, distasteful as I find your view of sports, Vic, I'd have to point out that it doesn't necessarily lead to complete disregard for rules. After all, however violent and desperate these contests would be, they would be circumscribed by some set of rules. The participants, then, would be locked in a violent struggle, subject to some restraints, even if these are rather permissive.

VICTOR: Right! And surely that parallels the circumstances of combat.

JUSTIN: Well, I'll concede that such a system wouldn't necessarily result in contempt for rules, but in the real world the tendency to move in that direction is pronounced. Look at professional football. Each year they have to enact new rules and penalties because quarterbacks and receivers are being virtually dismembered by "defenders" who are looking to break up both the play and the player. Look at pro hockey and pro basketball, where fines and civil suits are arising out of outright assaults on the ice and the court. I tell you, when winning becomes the sole objective, these abuses are just about inevitable.

VICTOR: Well, maybe there is some risk in that respect, but in a military organization we can exercise greater control. There's enough authority within the chain of command to permit effective supervision; we could nip these things in the bud.

JUSTIN: I'm not confident of that at all. When the kind of fierce competitiveness that you advocate becomes institutionalized, there'll be incredible pressure on units to field winning teams. The only acceptable explanation for a loss will be, "No excuse, sir; it won't happen again." Officials will be tempted to smile or to look the other way if the violence is sanctioned. Remember the consequences of the body-count approach in Vietnam? When you lose sight of, or appreciation for, the humanity of your opponent, all kinds of depravity become possible. Whatever the benefits of your proposal, they certainly do not outweigh the evil that occurs when we cease to respect one another's humanity. Look, why invite this kind of disaster? Why not continue to use sports in a more moderate way? The focus on performing well, without the harsh emphasis on winning, provides a wealth of benefits, which we've already mentioned.

VICTOR: I think you exaggerate the risk and the evil of these potential abuses. Furthermore, there is a powerful reason to emphasize winning. If our troops were to gain all the benefits of athletic participation except the "must-win" attitude, the program would not only be incomplete, it would actually damage our training effort. The idea that losing is acceptable--or even thinkable--must never be condoned. We've all agreed that in war we've got to win, and it can't be denied that a winning attitude and a winning tradition contribute to a team's--or an Army's--ability to win. When men have tasted victory, when they've faced severe tests and come up winners, when they know that their team or military organization has a history of winning, they will be more confident and more strongly motivated to achieve new victories. This factor could be a decisive one, especially when the odds appear to be against you. Every successful coach and manager knows the value of a winning tradition and is willing to pay a price to establish one. It's time for the Army to rediscover this idea and to promote it for all it's worth.

JUSTIN: I still say your view is simplistic and dangerous. Look . . .

HENRY-DAVID: Excuse me for cutting in, guys. I find this discussion stimulating and all, but I don't see that we're moving toward a resolution.

JUSTIN: Well, that's probably what makes the whole thing stimulating. Issues like these have no simple answers. There is a lot to be said on both sides of the question.

VICTOR: Yeah, but we can't always afford the luxury of being inconclusive. We can walk away from this table and leave the matter unresolved, but the problem won't go away. We still have a duty to prepare ourselves and our men for war, and I'm concerned that we're not doing as much as we might, perhaps not as much as we must.

JUSTIN: I agree that it is a genuine problem with serious ramifications, but I'm concerned that we may overreact and create new difficulties for ourselves.

HENRY-DAVID: Well, then. We have come to an agreement on something.

JUSTIN: We have? On what?

HENRY-DAVID: That we are all "concerned." And right now I'm concerned that if I don't get back over to the company the troops will be missing my sterling leadership.

VICTOR: Roger that. But, by the way, I'll bet each of you sterling leaders a case of Heineken that my company whips both of yours in the ARTEP's next week.

JUSTIN and HENRY-DAVID: You're on!

## BIBLIOGRAPHIC ESSAY

CPT MICHAEL W. TAYLOR

Whether one decides to agree with Justin, Vic, or H.D. largely depends on the theory of human nature to which one subscribes. The conflict is aptly represented by the metaphors employed in two widely read works that purport to unravel the nature of man: Jacob Bronowski's *Ascent of Man* and Desmond Morris's *The Naked Ape*. If one chooses to see man as ascending in some way, then perhaps we can hope that he can learn to exert a rational control over his combative behavior, restricting it even in circumstances as extreme as those encountered in war. Michael Walzer's *Just and Unjust Wars* defends this view by attacking the notion that war necessarily entails the abdication of moral values. Walzer agrees with General Sherman that war is indeed hell, but he does not concede that this hell has no limits. Instead, Walzer stresses the responsibility of a nation's military and civilian leaders to examine the policies and rules by which wars are begun and prosecuted. A crucial portion of his work attacks the often careless definition of "victory" and the abuses that are committed for its sake. Morris's unflattering picture of man as a hairless, territorial, and instinctively combative ape lends credibility to the view that man is, after all, only an animal that has in combat a natural tendency to aim for the jugular. Winning is the only thing, and the parameters of the contest become simplified. In this case moral language reduces to talk of Hobbesian self-interest and the possibility of identifying moral absolutes is disdained. Man will be man, and it makes as much sense to expect him to demonstrate civilized restraint as it does to expect a chimp to wear a tuxedo.

The debate among the officers reflects an enduring tension between fundamental cultural values of Puritan origin: Christian charity and individual success. Perry Miller's *The Puritans* clarifies the tension through his analysis of the basic tenets of Puritan theology. As members of the visible church, the Puritans compacted with one another to provide for the common needs of the society; however, as members of God's "elect," they believed that their works would prosper on earth. Such prosperity would show them to be in God's favor while at the same time giving them an advantage over their less fortunate--and presumably damned--peers. One's success was evidence that God was on his side.

One and a half centuries later, when Calvin had been usurped by Darwin, the impetus for success was given a renewed vitality. If God did not select the inheritors of the earth, then presumably nature did. Social Darwinism seemed to provide ample justification for the plutocratic ideas of men such as William Graham Sumner. Other writers, such as Francis Parkman, whose *Oregon Trail* actually predates Darwin's *Origin of Species*, began a trend of celebrating man as sportsman, superior to his natural environment as demonstrated by his ability to conquer or destroy as he chose. Theodore Roosevelt's advocacy of the "strenuous life" is perhaps the best known reflection of this attitude. As one considers Roosevelt's prosecution of the Spanish-American War, one cannot but wonder about the degree to which he saw the war as another area of competition in which the United States could establish its growing national strength. Winning becomes more than imply a military or national policy; it becomes a biological and historical imperative.

The two World Wars and the conflicts in Korea and Vietnam produced a change in national attitude. Charles Reich's *Greening of America* contends that a new national consciousness began emerging in the late sixties. Many began to reject the conventional attitudes regarding success, power, and winning in the arenas of sports, business, and national policy. Down with Roosevelt, up with Thoreau. Reich's book, and others like it, may have failed to recognize the influence of institutions, such as college and professional athletics, to say nothing of such win-oriented companies as IBM. Still, the values of these institutions became more open to criticism than ever before, and it is much easier now to find works attacking the dedication to winning in virtually all aspects of American life, especially in athletics.

If Justin, Vic, and H.D. were to conduct a survey of contemporary writing about athletics, they would discover a current trend to point out abuses of the metaphor that associates sports with battle, and also of the metaphor that associates success-oriented American social values with competitive sports. But while it may be a scandal that we often know a university's athletic reputation better than its academic one, the question of whether winning has become a perverted ideal in our society is complex. When applied to the military, the question becomes especially poignant. Is it possible for the military to be too concerned with victory? What are the dangers of accepting less than a winning performance? Does the military owe to itself or to the nation it defends a winning image? In the absence of war, where is that image to come from? Is Vic justified in demanding a winning tradition from the academies' athletic programs?

The discussion of Justin, Vic, and H.D. raises the question of whether war is analogous in some way to athletic competition. The images and metaphors we commonly employ indicate our tendency to believe that the analogy is valid. If we choose to support the analogy, we should be cautious; several of the works listed below indicate the abuses generated by a win-oriented mentality. Other works detail differing historical, sociological, philosophical, and scientific perspectives on competition. The questions they raise and the answers they offer should make us wonder about the appropriate price to pay for a winner. The teleology of victory, it seems, cannot be fully explored during a single discussion at the Officers' Club.

Atyeo, Don. *Blood & Guts: Violence in Sports*. New York & London: Paddington Press, Ltd., 1979. Atyeo's thesis supports those observers who think of contemporary athletics as pandering to the whims of both the participants and observers whose desire for winning and for violence blurs the distinction between athletics and gladiatorial combat. The author quotes soldiers, statesmen, and athletes who acknowledge or support the concept that winning is the most important aspect of athletic contests.

Bronowski, Jacob. *The Ascent of Man*. Boston: Little, Brown, and Co., 1973. The thesis of this well-known work is perhaps best expressed in the author's concluding paragraph: "We are nature's unique experiment to make the rational intelligence prove itself sounder than the reflex."

Butt, Susan D. *Psychology of Sport*. New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold Co., 1976. Ms. Butt looks at athletics from the perspective of the clinical psychologist as well as from that of a recognized athlete. She finds that contemporary athletes not only reflect but very often magnify the social problems of our society. A key factor in these problems is the emphasis placed on winning. Furthermore, she stipulates that the pressure of winning robs the athlete as well as the spectator of the opportunity to appreciate the aesthetic qualities of athletic competition.

Cady, Edwin H. *The Big Game*. Knoxville: The University Press, 1978. Professor Cady approaches his sophisticated argument from his perspective as a former college football player and as a literature Ph.D. His enthusiastic support of "big" college athletic programs stands against the tide of negative voices. Although he acknowledges the necessity of regulating such programs, he fails to make a convincing case for supporting them.

Dickey, Glenn. *The Jack Empire: Its Rise and Deserved Fall*. Radnor, PA: Chilton Book Co., 1974. As the title implies, Dickey contends that the adulation of athletes has promoted sports heroes into the focus of undeserved praise and unwarranted privilege. Society's ills are reflected in, if not fostered by, sports: male chauvinism, exploitative sex, and criminal obsession with winning, in games as well as politics.

Kolatch, Jonathan. *Sports, Politics, and Ideology in China*. New York: Jonathan David Publishers, 1972. Kolatch's work is a historical summary of the role of sports in twentieth-century China. Of particular interest is the author's assessment of the importance attached to sports and athletic competition in China's military units. In fact, as a result of Mao's influence, sports are given a military significance at all levels of competition. Marksmanship and martial arts form part of the regimen of much, if not most, of China's youth.

Leavitt, H. J. *Managerial Psychology*, 4th ed. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1958. In this book about organizational behavior, Leavitt devotes portions of two chapters to the concept of competition within hierarchical organizations. Central to his discussion is his application of Maslow's theory to the dynamics of competition and the will to win within a peer group.

Michener, James A. *Sports in America*. New York: Random House, 1976. A wide-ranging analysis of how we use and misuse sports told in a lively, anecdotal, provocative style. The author argues that we should place more emphasis upon sports that "promote health and give pleasure to the player instead of merely providing entertainment for the spectator."

McLris, Desmond. *The Naked Ape*. New York: Dell Publishing Co., 1967. A hotly debated work, *The Naked Ape* portrays man as an animal, who, despite his "progress," exhibits the traits of his distant past. The author suggests a dim future for the race unless it overcomes its natural tendencies.

Ralbovsky, Martin. *The Lords of the Locker Room*. New York: Peter H. Wyden, 1974. This work is another in a long series of books written to attack the abuses in high school athletics. Ralbovsky concentrates his attack on the coaches whose dedication to Lombardi's winning philosophy perverts the proper role of athletics in the physical development of the nation's youth.

Riordan, James. *Sport in Soviet Society*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1977. In this historical study, the author reviews Soviet policies from the 1920s, when sports were regarded as typical only of capitalistic individualism, to the 1970s. The Soviets now emphasize athletic excellence as a testimony to the superiority of the communist system.



- Shaw, Gary. *Meat on the Hoof*. New York: Dell Publishing Co., 1972. Shaw affords a look at major college football from the perspective of the insider. A former player for Darrel Royal at the University of Texas, Shaw examines the dehumanizing process undergone by players in order to become identified as winners.
- Sipes, R. "War, Sports and Aggression: An Empirical Test of Rival Theories." *American Anthropologist*, 75 (February 73); 64-86.
- Smith, L. T. *The American Dream and the National Game*. Bowling Green: Bowling Green National Press, 1975. Smith combines literature and sports history to give a refreshing insight into the nature of the American as revealed through the games he plays. He uses Thoreau, Captain Ahab, and Vince Lombardi to support his thesis that Americans somehow link "play," sports, and winning with the American ideal. The successful coach and the winning athlete become paradigms of the American ideal.
- Tutko, T. and W. Bruns. *Winning is Everything and Other American Myths*. New York: Macmillan Publishing Co., 1976. The authors condemn the attitude toward sports they find prevalent in the U.S. by asking, "Why can't we let Johnny and Jane play the game---and lose?" The pressure put on children to win the authors find especially irritating. Instead of allowing young people to develop their bodies and physical skills, coaches "bench" the less advanced players in order to have a winning season. The authors advocate a new attitude toward sports which would allow children to develop and to have fun without sacrificing their self image.
- Tutko, T. and T. Umberto. *Sports Psyching*. Los Angeles: J. P. Tarcher, 1976. In most of this book, the authors give advice about mentally preparing for competition. In the final chapters, however, winning becomes the focus of attention. The authors clearly deplore the notion that "winning is everything." Instead, they reaffirm Rice's notion that "how you played the game" is still important. According to the authors, the winners of a contest are not necessarily those who have the most points on the scoreboard.
- Walzer, Michael. *Just and Unjust Wars*. New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1977. Using a myriad of appropriate and sometimes tediously intricate historical examples, Walzer argues that war's brutality is no excuse for refusing to make moral distinctions. In the process, he admits he is skeptical whether America's leaders have understood the difference between "winning" and victory.

Shaw, Gary. *Meat on the Hoof*. New York: Dell Publishing Co., 1972.

Shaw affords a look at major college football from the perspective of the insider. A former player for Darrel Royal at the University of Texas, Shaw examines the dehumanizing process undergone by players in order to become identified as winners.

Sipes, R. "War, Sports and Aggression: An Empirical Test of Rival Theories." *American Anthropologist*, 75 (February 73), 64-86.

Smith, L. T. *The American Dream and the National Game*. Bowling Green: Bowling Green National Press, 1975. Smith combines literature and sports history to give a refreshing insight into the nature of the American as revealed through the games he plays. He uses Thoreau, Captain Ahab, and Vince Lombardi to support his thesis that Americans somehow link "play," sports, and winning with the American ideal. The successful coach and the winning athlete become paradigms of the American ideal.

Tutko, T. and W. Bruns. *Winning is Everything and Other American Myths*. New York: Macmillan Publishing Co., 1976. The authors condemn the attitude toward sports they find prevalent in the U.S. by asking, "Why can't we let Johnny and Jane play the game--and lose?" The pressure put on children to win the authors find especially irritating. Instead of allowing young people to develop their bodies and physical skills, coaches "bench" the less advanced players in order to have a winning season. The authors advocate a new attitude toward sports which would allow children to develop and to have fun without sacrificing their self image.

Tutko, T. and T. Umberto. *Sports Psyching*. Los Angeles: J. P. Tarcher, 1976. In most of this book, the authors give advice about mentally preparing for competition. In the final chapters, however, winning becomes the focus of attention. The authors clearly deplore the notion that "winning is everything." Instead, they reaffirm Rice's notion that "how you played the game" is still important. According to the authors, the winners of a contest are not necessarily those who have the most points on the scoreboard.

Walzer, Michael. *Just and Unjust Wars*. New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1977. Using a myriad of appropriate and sometimes tediously intricate historical examples, Walzer argues that war's brutality is no excuse for refusing to make moral distinctions. In the process, he admits he is skeptical whether America's leaders have understood the difference between "winning" and victory.